1	Appearances	
2	For the Government:	Laura E. Duffy UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
3		William P. Cole Caroline P. Han
4 5		ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS 880 Front Street, Suite 6293 San Diego, CA 92101
6	Ear the Defendants.	Jan Diego, en Jaioi
7	For the Defendants: (Mr. Moalin)	Marc B. Geller, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF MARC B. GELLER
8		1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1820 San Diego, CA 92101
9	(Mr. M. Mohamud)	Mahir T. Sherif, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF MAHIR T. SHERIF
10		3376 30th Street San Diego, CA 92104
11	(Mr. Doreh)	Kenneth J. Troiano, Esq.
12		LAW OFFICE OF KENNETH J. TROIANO P.O. Box 33536
13		San Diego, CA 92163
14	(Mr. A. Mohamud)	Holly S. Hanover, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF HOLLY S. HANOVER
15		1016 La Mesa Avenue Spring Valley, CA 91977
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	<b>I</b>	

## San Diego, California - Thursday, January 20, 2011 1 2 (Defendants are being assisted by a Somali interpreter.) 3 THE CLERK: Calling matters 2 and 3 on calendar, 4 matter No. 2, 10-CR-4246, USA versus Basaaly Saeed Moalin. 5 Counsel, could you please state your appearance. 6 MR. GELLER: Marc Geller, your Honor, on behalf of 7 Basaaly Moalin. For the record -- good morning, your Honor. 8 Marc Geller appearing on behalf of Basaaly Moalin. He is 9 entering the courtroom in custody. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 MR. SHERIF: Good morning, your Honor. Mahir Sherif on behalf of Mr. Mohamad Mohamad Mohamud. He's in 12 13 custody, your Honor, and present. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 15 MR. TROIANO: Good morning, your Honor. Kenneth 16 Troiano on behalf Mr. Doreh. He's not present yet. I do 17 need a brief moment with him, if I could, before we start. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. HANOVER: Good morning, your Honor. Holly 20 Hanover on behalf of Ahmed Mohamud. He is also present 21 before the Court in white. 22 MR. GELLER: Also for the record, your Honor, it 23 doesn't appear that we have an interpreter that's -- or they 24 have headsets that are working with the interpreter. 25 MR. COLE: Your Honor, William Cole and Caroline

```
Han for the United States.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you. We're still missing one.
 3
    Whose client is missing at this time?
 4
               MR. SHERIF: I think we have all four, your Honor.
 5
     Oh, we are missing a client.
 6
               DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL: There's one in the back, your
 7
    Honor. Be out in just a second. They're bringing him out.
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Did you
 8
    say there's no interpreter?
 9
10
               THE CLERK: Yes, there is, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT:
                          There is, okay. Very good.
12
               MR. SHERIF: Your Honor, is the Court going to
13
    arraign them on the superseding indictment?
14
               THE COURT: No -- well, I understand the
15
     superseding indictment has been issued in the case joining
16
     all four gentlemen at this point; is that correct, Mister --
17
               MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor. The superseding
18
     indictment was returned. It simply merges the two cases;
     there's no new charges, but it does add Mr. Ahmed Nasir
19
20
     Taalil Mohamud as a fourth defendant in the main case, 4246,
21
     so I suppose these gentlemen would need to be arraigned on
22
    the superseding indictment.
23
               MR. SHERIF: If that's the case, I'm going to need
24
     a minute, your Honor, because I haven't gone over the
```

superseding indictment with my client.

MR. GELLER: I haven't --1 2 THE COURT: One at a time, please. Mr. Sherif, how 3 much time would you like? 4 MR. SHERIF: Five, ten minutes, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. I'm certainly prepared to 6 give you additional time if you'd like. I don't want you in 7 any way to feel rushed. MR. SHERIF: No, I'm not being rushed, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Geller? MR. GELLER: I don't have a copy of the superseding 10 11 indictment. THE COURT: All right. Tell you what. Why don't 12 13 we take about ten minutes at this point, all right, so that 14 Mr. Cole can provide copies of the superseding indictment to 15 all counsel, counsel can stake a look at the superseding indictment, Mr. Sherif can confer with his client if he needs 16 17 to confer, other counsel may confer with their clients if 18 they seem that necessary, and then we'll proceed. 19 MR. GELLER: Thank you, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Very good. Just let us know when 21 you're ready to proceed, counsel. 22 (There was a break in the proceedings.) 23 THE COURT: Okay. Have all counsel had an 24 opportunity to review the superseding indictment and review 25

that with your client if necessary?

```
MR. SHERIF: Yes, your Honor.
 1
 2
              MS. HANOVER: Yes, your Honor.
 3
              MR. TROIANO: Yes, your Honor.
 4
               MR. GELLER: Yes, your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you.
 6
    right. Let us proceed with the arraignment then on the
 7
    superseding indictment. The superseding indictment I assume
 8
    is still going to bear case number 10-CR-4246; is that
 9
     correct, Mister --
10
              MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Very good.
12
               THE CLERK: Basaaly Saeed Moalin, is that your true
13
    name?
14
               DEFENDANT MOALIN: (In English) Yes.
15
               THE CLERK: Mohamad Mohamad Mohamud, is that your
16
     true name?
17
               DEFENDANT M. MOHAMUD: (In English) Yes.
18
               THE CLERK: Issa Doreh, is that your true name?
19
               DEFENDANT DOREH: (In English) Yes, ma'am.
20
               THE CLERK: Ahmed Nasir Taalil Mohamud, is that
21
     your true name?
22
               DEFENDANT A. MOHAMUD: (In English) Yes.
23
               THE CLERK: You are each informed that a
24
    superseding indictment has been filed charging you with
25
     conspiracy to provide material support to terrorists;
```

```
conspiracy to provide material support to a foreign terrorist
 1
 2
     organization; conspiracy to kill in a foreign country;
 3
     conspiracy to launder monetary instruments; providing
 4
    material support to terrorists. Have you received a copy?
 5
               MR. GELLER: On behalf of Mr. Moalin, we have, and
 6
    we'd waive further reading.
 7
               MR. SHERIF: On behalf of Mr. Mohamad Mohamad
 8
    Mohamud, we have, your Honor, and we waive reading.
               MR. TROIANO: Yes as to Mr. Doreh as well.
 9
10
               MS. HANOVER: As to Mr. Ahmed Mohamud as well, yes.
               THE COURT: And you waive further reading,
11
12
    Mr. Troiano?
13
               MR. TROIANO: Yes, I do.
               THE COURT: Ms. Hanover, you waive further reading?
14
15
               MS. HANOVER: Yes, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT:
                          All right.
17
               THE CLERK: Gentlemen, you are further informed
18
     that you're entitled to a trial by jury or a trial by the
19
     Court; to be represented by counsel at all stages of the
20
    proceedings before the Court; and to have witnesses summoned
21
     to testify in your behalf. How do you now plead to the
22
    superseding indictment?
23
               MR. GELLER: With respect to the charge alleged
24
     against Mr. Moalin, we'd ask that not guilty pleas be
25
     entered.
```

```
THE COURT: A not guilty plea will be entered on
 1
 2
    behalf of Mr. Moalin with respect to all counts.
 3
               MR. SHERIF: Not quilty on behalf of Mr. Mohamud,
     your Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: A not quilty plea will be entered with
 6
    respect to Mr. Mohamud as to all counts.
 7
               MR. TROIANO: Not guilty for Mr. Doreh as to all
 8
     counts.
               THE COURT: A not guilty plea will be entered as to
 9
10
    Mr. Doreh as to all counts.
11
               MS. HANOVER: Not guilty as to Ahmed Mohamud as
12
    well, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: All right. Not guilty as to Mr. Ahmed
    Mohamud as to all counts will be entered. All right.
14
15
     you, counsel. All right. Gentlemen, you certainly may be
16
     seated if you wish.
17
               Okay. So are you moving at this time then,
18
    Mr. Cole, to have case number 10-CR-4645 dismissed without
19
    prejudice in light of the superseding indictment filed in
20
     4246?
21
               MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Case 10-CR-4645 JM is
23
     dismissed without prejudice at this time. The --
24
               MR. COLE: Your Honor, with respect to that
25
     dismissal --
```

1 THE COURT: -- motions -- excuse me.

MR. COLE: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: The motions that are filed in 4645 are deemed filed in case 10-CR-4246, the sole remaining case in this litigation. Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: That was one of the points I was going to raise, and I just wanted to also make sure that the protective order that was signed in the dismissed case is -- there's already an identical protective order in the current case. I just wanted to make sure it's clear on the record that the fourth defendant is subject to that protective order as well.

THE COURT: Yes, that will be the order. The fourth defendant is subject to the protective order that was earlier filed in case 10-CR-4645 as it is now deemed filed in case 10-CR-4246 with respect to Mr. Ahmed Mohamud, and of course Holly Hanover is deemed appointed -- is appointed for Mr. Mohamud in case 10-CR-4246.

MR. COLE: The only other matter I can think of in regards to essentially transfering the new case is the order of detention that was existing in the old case, I assume that's transfered to the new case.

THE COURT: All motions and all orders --

MR. COLE: Okay.

THE COURT: -- that were filed or issued in case

10-CR-4645 are deemed filed and/or issued in case 10-CR-4246 as it has been indicted in the superseding indictment. Okay. Can we move to discovery? Let's monitor the case for discovery at this time. Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor. We have provided what we consider to be the great bulk of discovery in this case. Today we have also put out for discovery -- counsel will get it after court today; it's available now -- the disk that we discussed at the last hearing. What we've done, your, Honor, is we provided approximately 870 some-odd audio calls to the defense --

THE COURT: May I stop you -- and please excuse me interrupting counsel -- not just you, Mr. Cole; I'm sure I'll need to interrupt counsel for the defense a few times. As I recall, the audio disk that you had had 1200 calls on it; at least that was my understanding.

MR. COLE: That was. That's what I said before. I was mistaken. There were a lot of duplicates that -- and when it winnowed out, the number of calls, we've turned over 876. We do anticipate that there may be in the near future some dozens of additional calls, but we're not going to get to 1200. It's going to be substantially less than 1200. I'm thinking at this point -- I'm going to be surprised if we get over 1,000 calls. I think it will stay right at or under 1,000 audio calls.

THE COURT: So then you're envisioning a larger group of secondary calls that you're going to be providing than you did last time we were together. Last time we were together, you indicated the disk had 1200 calls and that there might be another 10 or 20 calls that would be trickling in; but now you're saying that secondary group is more than 10 or 20?

MR. COLE: Yeah, we think, instead, the first group is much smaller than we anticipated, the second group's going to be a little bit bigger. And the reason for that, there was a miscommunication that was largely my fault with the agent; we were using different vocabularies talking about different classes of calls. We've straightened that out. There's not going to be 1200 calls; there's just not going to be. There's going to be I think ultimately closer to a thousand.

THE COURT: Okay. How many in the second group,
Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: We are anticipating about 110 to 115.

They're in decreasing -- candidly, in terms of planning
budgets or thinking about this, they're in decreasing
relevance to this case, but in an abundance of caution, we're
making them available. Just so your Honor is aware, we think
that the 876 includes -- you know, really even that was
beyond probably what defense is going to find entirely

helpful, but we're providing it. We have provided today --

THE COURT: May I stop you there --

MR. COLE: Yes.

THE COURT: -- because last time we were together, you indicated that of the 1200 calls you thought were on the disk, about 120 had been defined as material. Now you seem to be saying there's a larger group that would be deemed material.

MR. COLE: No, no. What I'm saying is that what we did was we have given -- we have given them the verbatim -- partial or complete verbatim translations of the calls that we deemed to be sort of the government's case-in-chief, the material, most relevant matters, and that's about 120, 126. We've provided those.

We've also today -- defense counsel today will receive the -- what we discussed last time, which was the segregated disk, so instead of having to pick through the 800 and some calls to find those 126, they will have a disk today that is just the audio for those 126 phone calls that match the verbatim translations they received.

Now, what I should have -- what I meant to represent last time and hope I can make clear now is that those are what the government deemed most relevant case-in-chief calls. The others -- the number kind of spreads out there, and we're simply trying to be generous in

terms of Rule 16 in our view of it and in terms of what we can make available in discovery from the audio intercepts.

As we discussed last time, I'm reluctant to pass my judgment to the defense as to what they may find relevant, but that's where it stands right now from the government's standpoint.

about 126 intercepts that would be material from the government's perspective and translated. Didn't you have to go through all of these intercepts though one by one to determine whether it fell into the material pile or not?

MR. COLE: Yes. The -- is the Court's question if there's summaries or translations for other calls; is that --

THE COURT: Yes, that's where I'm ultimately getting because if you had -- it seems to me you would have to have a translation of either the entire intercept that you deemed nonmaterial -- or a summary of it -- but in English so that you could understand it.

MR. COLE: We do not have verbatim translations for -- when I say verbatim, I mean line-by-line, complete verbatim translations of all these other calls. There are summaries, very -- perhaps similar to a T-3 case, there are, you know, line sheets or summaries of calls. We are working now to make these available to the defense, but we do not have them in a format that we are authorized to release at this time. And so we anticipate, your Honor, that we will

2.2

obtain the authority to release summaries, but we -- at this time we can't commit to that on our own. I hope to be able to report to defense counsel soon the status of that.

THE COURT: How much time would be necessary to acquire authorization to release the summaries of the additional calls that have been at least initially deemed nonmaterial by the government?

MR. COLE: We think we'll have an answer within two or three weeks. Now, I can tell you that after we get the -- assuming we get the affirmative answer, from the records management standpoint, having them be passed over to us and having been checked and passed over with any necessary redactions is a little bit more cumbersome, but we'll know and be able to tell defense counsel in I think two or three weeks if we're in fact going to be able to make whatever summary is available. Some of these summaries are very brief, but whatever summary we do have we would like to make available; and I think we'll have an answer to defense counsel within a few weeks on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's move on then.

MR. COLE: Beyond that, your Honor, we have -- the remaining discovery in the case that will still be coming is really what I'd describe typical to any -- just about any case you'd see in this courtroom. It's going to be -- I'd be surprised -- it will be, you know, document discovery, and I

would be surprised -- reports, witness interviews, et cetera -- and I'd be surprised if it exceeds one ream of paper total, probably much less than that. And we are continually in the case of course reviewing files and making sure we're complying with discovery. I just don't anticipate a large volume beyond the audio.

We are going to be looking at some seized computer media to see if there's anything off of that that needs to be turned over in discovery. We will provide that in electronic form as soon as we determine that it's either Brady or Rule 16. It's not voluminous either, your Honor. There were searches of the Shidaal Express, which was, you might recall --

THE COURT: Five or six boxes where the absence of receipts you felt was --

MR. COLE: Those have been made available -THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COLE: -- and so -- yeah. So, really, it's just cleanup discovery that will not be voluminous. I'm not saying it won't be important if we find something that needs to be turned over, it won't be -- from a budgeting standpoint or from a time management standpoint, it's not going to be voluminous discovery from here on out.

THE COURT: When you say they've been made available, the material from Shidaal Express, are you saying

2.2

that the original -- the original documentation in boxes have been made available for inspection by counsel or has everything been copied off and made available? What --

MR. COLE: What we've done is we gave the electronic records that we -- the electronic spreadsheet or database we gave over to defense counsel on disk. The paper receipts we've made available for inspection and for them to determine whatever, if anything, they want to copy. We don't intend to copy all the receipts. They're not standard size; it would be very time-consuming to copy all the receipts for no particular reason. If defense counsel wants to make arrangements to bring in a copy service, we'd be more than happy to make them available for that reason. Or if they want to flag specific things, we could negotiate from there I guess the copy issue.

THE COURT: Anything else on discovery, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: I don't think so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask counsel what their concerns, if any, are with respect to discovery. Mr. Sherif?

MR. SHERIF: Yes, your Honor. Before I start, perhaps I could ask counsel how many conversations there are overall because it seems like the number has been reduced this time. So I just want to know how many they have and how many are they turning over. I think that's a fair question to ask them at this stage so we don't --

THE COURT: Well, I think it is fair, and I'll certainly -- you know, you have good working relationship; I assume you --

MR. SHERIF: Yes, we do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- can confer with Mr. Cole, so let Mr. Cole -- discuss that with Mr. Cole unless Mr. Cole has a ready answer at this point to the question.

MR. COLE: You know, your Honor, I'd rather discuss it with him off line just to make sure I don't get it wrong. I think I know. There are -- I will tell your Honor that there are a great number more audio intercepts that we are turning over in this case, that we are -- there are many audio intercepts that are not pertinent or relevant to this matter and that we do not intend to turn over, and that is absolutely true; it's a number that would dwarf the number that we're turning over. And I can discuss that more with Mr. Sherif out of court. But Rule 16 of course it refers to relevant audio recordings, not just audio recordings of a defendant, and so that's part of why I described it -- the number we are giving, we feel we've gone even beyond -- just to make sure there's a buffer there -- beyond Rule 16. We have gone beyond where we think is strictly relevant even under Rule 16 and provided hundreds of additional calls on discovery to make sure we're complying with Rule 16 and Brady, but --

THE COURT: Well, I'm a little unclear now. Does your -- does your number of 126 intercepts, is that what you're talking about is going above and beyond or is the figure of 126 plus some additional number what you've turned over? In other words -- and where does the 876 fit in?

MR. COLE: Right. So let me back up. If we take the 876 we've turned over, and assuming, as I mentioned earlier, we get ultimately to a number around a thousand, just assuming, a rough figure, we have 126 that we as the government deemed relevant and important enough to go to the time and expense of getting verbatim translations from Somali, which is a burdensome process, prepared.

THE COURT: And put on a separate disk.

MR. COLE: And put on a separate disk for the defense. We certainly agree that there are other calls that are relevant -- not important enough to warrant, in our view, preparing verbatim translations but relevant under Rule 16 or Brady and have turned those over to the defense. Exactly how many between 126 and 1,000 a defense attorney would agree with me as to, you know, where the line is on what's relevant, I can't give you an exact number; I just know that the approach we've taken is to go beyond -- I've reviewed the summaries, and I have attempted to go far beyond ones that I deem relevant under Rule 16 or Brady, to the tune of hundreds of calls beyond what I deem relevant but have nevertheless,

```
since we have a summary for them, since we have -- since we
 1
 2
     can make them available, we will, and that's what we've done.
 3
    But there are many thousands of calls that simply are not
 4
    relevant to this matter, that are not -- that we don't intend
 5
     to produce.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sherif, hopefully that is
 7
    information that provides additional assistance and guidance
 8
     for you, and I'm sure you'll be able to talk to Mr. Cole
 9
     about that. Have you had an opportunity to review what has
10
    been provided to you thus far?
11
               MR. SHERIF: Yes, we have, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Have you reviewed the 126
13
     on the separate disk?
14
               MR. SHERIF: Yes, I have.
15
               THE COURT: And have you reviewed the other number
16
     of conversations over and above the 126 with marginal
17
    relevance?
18
               MR. SHERIF: No, I have not.
               THE COURT: Okay. I would think counsel would need
19
20
     to do that just to get the spirit of what's being provided to
21
     see if anything else really does need to be provided, and I'm
22
     confident you can work with Mr. Cole on that and anything
23
     that's reasonably requested would be provided. Okay.
24
    there anything else you had, Mr. Sherif?
```

MR. SHERIF: No, your Honor.

```
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Geller, anything on --
 1
 2
               MR. GELLER: Yes, your Honor. I would just like
 3
     to --
 4
               THE COURT: -- discovery, on discovery?
 5
               MR. GELLER: Yes, your Honor.
 6
               THE CLERK:
                           Okay.
 7
               MR. GELLER: Well, it's on discovery, and I don't
 8
     know if the Court wants me to address budgetary concerns
 9
     right --
10
               THE COURT: No, I don't. Right now just discovery.
11
     I'm just trying to do this in an orderly way.
12
              MR. GELLER: No, thank you, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Mr. Troiano?
14
               MR. TROIANO: Yes, your Honor. I had made a
15
    request of my client's statements made before or after his
16
     arrest. I have received his postarrest statement. I know
17
     there are at least three other prearrest statements, and I'm
18
    not sure what the position the government's going to take on
    whether they're relevant or discoverable under the Rule 16,
19
20
    but we would ask that the Court be provided those statements
21
    in camera to review and not have to accept the government's
22
    representations on whether they're relevant because clearly
23
    if they were talking to my client, they're relevant to me.
24
               THE COURT: Well, on that issue, Mr. Cole, I think
25
     the last time we were together, you indicated that 302s would
```

be provided, the statements of defendants would be provided, and other materials as well, and I think you indicated at the time it would be far down the road. But in terms of -- in terms of what's being provided to the defense, why -- are you providing all the statements of defendants?

MR. COLE: We -- I anticipate that with the statements he's talking about, his client's own statements that were made to law enforcement prior --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COLE: -- that we will be turning those over.

We'll look at those -- Ms. Han and I will look at those in

the next two weeks and likely will turn them all over to Mr.

Troiano. If we don't, we'll make him of aware of the number

we didn't so that we can raise this issue with your Honor and

certainly address it.

made by the defendants in connection with this
investigation -- that is, interviews and statements made to
the authorities -- should be provided to defense counsel.
And if, as you say, there's something that's going over that
you're not providing, then you'll need to at the earliest
possible time provide notice of that to Mr. Troiano and then
submit those materials in camera so that I can --

MR. COLE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- review them and make appropriate

orders. Okay. 1 2 MR. TROIANO: That's all. 3 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hanover? 4 MS. HANOVER: Yes, your Honor. I did receive an 5 audio recording of my client's statements after he was 6 arrested as well. During the discussion there was talk by agents about a few other money transfer companies that may 7 8 have records that have not been around over to defense counsel yet as well -- I know a Wells Fargo account was 9 mentioned as well, but I've not seen that yet in discovery, 10 11 and I was wondering if the government would be turning those 12 over anytime soon. 13 THE COURT: Even assuming that they're aware of 14 them or have them. 15 MS. HANOVER: I'm assuming they're aware because 16 the agents were discussing them. 17 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Cole? 18 MR. COLE: Yes. There is a -- we will be turning over -- some of the additional discovery will be some Wells 19

MR. COLE: Yes. There is a -- we will be turning over -- some of the additional discovery will be some Wells Fargo bank account records for a Wells Fargo bank account, so Ms. Hanover and the other defense counsel will get those.

Again, they're not voluminous. We'll turn those over. And I don't know what other money transmitting businesses she may be referring to, but I can discuss that with her off line as well --

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Please. 1 2 MR. COLE: -- and if there are records in our 3 possession, I'm sure we'll turn those over. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. 5 MS. HANOVER: And additionally I was wondering if 6 the government would be turning over actual telephone company records of phone calls being made from the various telephones 7 that are involved in this. 8 MR. COLE: We will look at the -- yes, there's 9 subscriber information that will be provided for various 10 11 phone numbers as well as toll records; to the extent we have 12 them available, that could be provided as well. So we will 13 be looking at that, and that will go over in the ordinary 14 course for sure, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hanover, anything further? 16 MS. HANOVER: Off the top of my head, that's what I 17 had, your Honor. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. 19 MR. SHERIF: Your Honor, I have one more issue with 20 regards to discovery. 21 THE COURT: Please. 22 MR. SHERIF: Your Honor, the issue is that my 23 client needs to get ahold of and read the verbatims that have 24 been provided; however, they're subject to the protective 25

order, and Nellie Klein at MCC could not assure me that

somehow they were not going to get into the hands of others at MCC. Obviously he doesn't have any kind of reasonable privacy there, so I was wondering how --

THE COURT: Well, that's not really a discovery-related matter vis-a-vis the government. We can work on that if necessary; if that's going to be an issue, then I can work with MCC personnel to address any issue that you've just raised.

MR. SHERIF: Fair enough. Thank you.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay. Then moving on next to the next issue. Mr. Cole, over and above discovery, what -- any additional issues that you have relative to the protective order that's been signed? The case is has been declared complex. Any other matters that need to be addressed at this time?

MR. COLE: No, your Honor, just that -- that one issue. I know we filed a motion about the Speedy Trial Act and excluding time until our next -- whenever our next hearing is going to be. But has your Honor already addressed that? We had filed that, and I don't think we've had a hearing on that unless your court handled it on the papers.

THE COURT: On the issue of what now? The protective order's been --

MR. COLE: The protective order's all squared away; there's no issue.

THE COURT: You're talking about complexity, declaration of complexity?

2.2

MR. COLE: Yeah. We filed a joint motion -
THE COURT: I know. Mr. Sherif never filed any
opposition. He was given a -- I assume -- I assume that
the -- I had suggested earlier that counsel enter into a
stipulation setting forth the grounds for a declaration of
complexity or, if there were no agreement on that, then we'd
set the matter for hearing. Counsel was given a date for
filing any opposition. I believe your position is at this
point, Mr. Sherif, you don't oppose a declaration of
complexity.

MR. SHERIF: Well, your Honor, my position may change, but I've talked to counsel and have let him know that -- I didn't want to shoot in the dark; I wanted to get the discovery and see after reviewing it if it was in fact complex or not. I have the discovery now, and given two, three weeks, I think I can make a determination on that issue together with my client of course.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm happy to rule at any time on this issue, but if you'd like to have more time such that you could enter into an agreement, into a stipulation, that would be even better. So if you're asking for additional time, we can certainly address that at the next hearing date. I know you've filed no opposition up to this point.

MR. SHERIF: That's correct. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. We'll just trail that 3 matter then. Obviously any time that's been -- during which 4 motions have been filed by any defendant tolls the Speedy 5 Trial Act, and that will certainly happen until the next 6 motion hearing because of the pendency of motions. 7 Anything -- anything further from the government as we 8 continue to monitor the case, Mr. Cole? 9 MR. COLE: No, thank you, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sherif, anything further we 11 need to address at this point? 12 MR. SHERIF: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Geller? 14 MR. GELLER: Yeah, I want to address concerns I 15 have based on Mr. Moalin's incarceration at CCA and time constraints that I've already experienced, problems in regard 16 17 to that with review of the discovery. So I don't know if the 18 Court wants me to address that at this time or not. 19 THE COURT: Let's not address it right now. 20 think that might be more appropriately addressed in a request 21 that you might file, an application you might file as to 22 exactly what your needs are and how often you need to have 23 access to Mr. Moalin and what's being provided, and then

perhaps I can work with you on that and involve MCC. I don't

know that the government has any standing to address that

24

issue, Mr. Geller.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GELLER: Well, I'm not sure that the government doesn't because -- I don't know if it was in this case or in another case where I was led to believe that the government does have some power to try and move people, and one of the things -- I know that we're dealing with budgetary constraints, and I was going to ask the Court for further time to submit a budget because -- maybe I should address that at this point because we're talking about discovery that hasn't yet been disseminated, and we don't know how much more -- we have a pretty good idea from what was stated here on the record, but we don't have -- we don't have an idea of exactly when, although we don't -- I know at this point that he's saying that he's going to turn over more discovery after the deadline that's been previously set to submit a budget, so I'm going to ask for an extension with respect to the submission of a budget based on the fact that there's a lot of unknown material.

THE COURT: You're joining about three or four different issues here, aren't you? Aren't you talking about discovery, you're talking about submission of a budget, which is something that you're going to be getting into very shortly with Ms. Rutledge, you're talking about -- you're talking about placement of your client; you got a lot of moving parts here. So aside from this issue that you've --

let me ask you this: Have you talked to Mr. Cole? I mean to the extent you think the government has ability to move people around, have you talked to Mr. Cole?

MR. GELLER: I brought it up, and I've also, based upon the Court's suggestion, spoken with -- I left a message with Nellie Klein and she's left a message with me and she said she was working on it, and so I think that that's -- you know, I don't know if -- maybe we can just ask Mr. Cole if he has any power over that.

THE COURT: Well, have you asked him that when you've been discussing it?

MR. GELLER: We discussed it, and he said he was going to look into that.

THE COURT: Okay. I think he should. I don't want to take up any court time on this issue, but I think what you bring up is a salient issue; I mean if you're not getting access to your client, then that's a -- you know, that's a circumstance that we need to work on.

MR. GELLER: Yeah. And I'm not, so I think -THE COURT: Talk to Mr. Cole. I have some concern
about how limited Mr. Cole's ability to influence BOP on the
placement of these gentlemen might be, but I'm certainly
available to discuss any of these issues informally if we
need to --

MR. GELLER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- address them and to make sure that 1 2 you're having sufficient access to your client. 3 MR. GELLER: Yes. Thank you. 4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Troiano, 5 anything else? 6 MR. TROIANO: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hanover, anything else? 7 8 MS. HANOVER: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. I do want to set the next 10 hearing date so that we can continue to monitor the 11 voluminous discovery in this case, discuss any further concerns that anyone might have. I do encourage you in the 12 13 meantime, however, obviously to be working on this issue that 14 you've raised, Mr. Geller, because I think it's important, 15 and then if circumstances need to be addressed, then they 16 will be, but I want to give you an opportunity to work with 17 Mr. Cole and work with Nellie Klein further. Okay. 18 MR. GELLER: Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. All right. 20 your suggestion -- what's your recommendation as to the 21 setting of the next hearing date, Mr. Cole? 22 MR. COLE: We're recommending -- I talked to at 23 least Mr. Troiano and Mr. Geller about this in connection 24 with the motion concerning the Speedy Trial, and we were

proposing a status hearing in late April or early May.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sherif? 1 2 MR. SHERIF: Your Honor, I think that's too far 3 I think perhaps we should just set like a 60-day 4 status hearing and see where we are. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Geller, 60 days? 6 MR. GELLER: Well, I share Mr. Cole's belief, but 7 I'll submit that. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Troiano? 9 MR. TROIANO: I agree with what Mr. Cole suggests 10 from my understanding of the complexity issues that it should 11 be dealt with on a hearing-by-hearing basis, and I think that 12 that would give us a bit of time to digest the case and know 13 where we stand, and then the next hearing after that would 14 have more meaning to it. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Hanover? 16 MS. HANOVER: Your Honor, that's fine. Any date 17 the Court sets I'm fine with. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Let me take a look here at the 19 calendar. We'll set this for a Thursday. We're basically 20 toward the end of January at this point. We'll set something 21 for early April. April 7, Thursday, April 7, 9 a.m., your 22 next status hearing. All motions are continued -- all 23 pending motions are continued to that date. As a result time 24 is excludable under the Speedy Trial Act between today and

25

April 7.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to ask counsel to remain to meet with Ms. Rutledge, if you would, please. I am fully expecting by that next hearing date you would have received your response that you need, Mr. Cole, to release the summaries of the additional intercepts over and above the 126 that you've designated as material and have been -- those which have been translated. And also, furthermore, that if the answer is yes, you may -- you are authorized to release those summaries, that they will have been released sufficiently in advance of the next hearing date of April 9 such that if there are any issues with respect to those summaries, we can address those as well. So I do want to make a good bit of headway with respect to that particular issue. I'm fully expecting that the Wells Fargo records will have been either provided or made available by that time. And you've indicated that the five or six boxes from Shidaal Express have already been made available, is that correct, for inspection?

MR. COLE: Yes. We let counsel know pretty much right when the case was indicted they could arrange an appointment to inspect those at their pleasure.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Okay. Those are the areas I think we really need to concentrate on. And feel free to contact chambers if we need to set up an in camera. I know you'll have your statements by that time, Mr. Troiano,

or the government will have provided any statements to which you're not privy to me for in camera inspection. But I'm expecting that the statements of defendants themselves in connection with this case with the -- any interviews or statements to authorities will have been provided. But as I started to say, if anything -- if there's a need to address any of the matters particularly of the type you mention, Mr. Geller, don't hesitate to contact chambers after you've talked to Mr. Cole, and we'll certainly be able to meet on short notice to address those types of issues.

MR. GELLER: Very well, because what I plan to do is speak with Mr. Cole this morning, and if we don't have something — I should point out, and I will, that it's taken me maybe six phone calls and six weeks to play telephone tag with Nellie Klein and accomplish nothing, and also I attempted the same thing with the marshal's service, with the warden at CCA, and I'm getting nowhere, and I'm getting very frustrated.

If we are going to need to meet in an in camera setting on a chambers conference a short notice, that before you do that, that you put something in writing, some kind of an application where you tell me exactly what your experience has been, exactly what you feel would be sufficient for your client's needs so that if I get involved, I know what I'm

dealing with, okay?

MR. GELLER: Very well. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can talk to Nellie Klein, and I can indicate that you feel these are the needs for you and your client, this is what needs to be done, and it will just facilitate I think the communication.

MR. GELLER: Well, one of the things I think that I should point out -- and it's very brief -- is that she indicated to me -- Ms. Klein indicated to me that she needed to speak with the warden's office to see if their internal procedures would allow him to be at the MCC inasmuch as there's a co-defendant that's at the MCC, and I don't know -- I don't believe -- I don't know if the co-defendant is in special housing or not, and the special housing -- she said that she felt that he wasn't going -- in need of special housing but there are rules and regulations -- there's just a lot of red tape. So I can give the Court a rough idea, but I'm not sure on paper I'll be able to tell the Court a lot more about it.

THE COURT: Well, all I'm saying is that whatever requests you have should ultimately be made in the form of an application; I'd appreciate it being made in writing so that I know exactly what I'm dealing with, what the issues are so that they can be properly addressed with Nellie Klein. This would all be after you've had a chance to talk to Mr. Cole to

the extent you feel he may have some ability here to optimize 1 2 or, if not optimize, improve your situation with respect to 3 access. 4 MR. GELLER: Very well. Are we going to on the 5 record address the budgetary concerns --6 THE COURT: No. 7 MR. GELLER: -- because one of the things -- I 8 don't know if the Court would be getting involved in this 9 either, but I think the Court should, with respect to the 10 deadline we have to submit the first budget --11 THE COURT: That's not a concern that needs to be 12 addressed on the record at this point --13 MR. GELLER: Very well, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: -- really. I think you'll understand 15 Okay. Very good. Okay then. We will see you next on why. 16 April 9 if not -- is it April 9 or April 7? April 7. 17 you. April 7 at 9 a.m. And if counsel could remain behind 18 for discussions with Ms. Rutledge. Thank you. 19 (The proceedings were concluded.) 20 21 22 23 24

## Certificate of Reporter I hereby certify that I am a duly appointed, qualified, and acting Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the mentioned cause on the date or dates listed on the title page of the transcript; and that the format used herein complies with the rules and requirements of the United States Judicial Conference. Dated February 25, 2014 at San Diego, California. /s/ Debra M. Henson (electronic) Debra M. Henson Official Court Reporter